

**GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE**

**February 05, 2003
Conference Rooms 2 & 3**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: William Tunstall Chris Lewis Kevin Carlson
Ramin Moshiri Charles Moore Daniel
Munoz
Scott Vinson Mary Wylie

MEMBERS ABSENT: William Hall; Carl A. Nelson; Russ Hall; Nate Rubin

STAFF PRESENT: Ed Batchelder, General Plan Update Project Manager
Bob Leiter, Director of Planning & Building
Cheryl Dye, Economic Development Manager
Bryan Ducote, Principal Community Development
Specialist
Tony Lettieri, Land Use & Transportation Coordinator
Rabbia Phillip, Recording Secretary, General Plan
Update

CALL TO ORDER- The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. It was confirmed that a quorum was present.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES- The minutes of December 4 were approved as presented..

2. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE EDS TO THE GPU

Ed Batchelder gave a brief overview of what would be covered in the presentations to this committee. The goal was to orient the members to the content of the existing General Plan, the GP requirements and the parallels to the EDS; review the EDS with more attention to the parts of it directly related to land use and transportation; and the economic development focus of the General Plan. The presenters were Tony Lettieri, Bob Leiter and Cheryl Dye.

Tony Lettieri distributed two sets of documents, current General Plan Land Use element overview and an excerpt of the economic and fiscal element from

the State General Plan guidelines. He noted that the points listed on the guidelines for consideration have already been taken into account in the EDS which was a positive reflection on this committee that the work they have undertaken so clearly aligned with the State's guidelines.

Tony walked through the points listed and made comparisons with the existing and projected for each of the topics. He pointed out the areas that were defined by the 1989 General Plan are also focus areas for the current General Plan update, such as the Urban Core and Downtown and the Eastern Urban Center and Bayfront, Broadway, the Greenbelt and gateways such as F Street. He mentioned that the MTDB was preparing a comprehensive transit plan to incorporate bus and fixed rail to provide the city with system that would serve the gateways and activity centers and enhance connectivity to the south. The preservation of existing stable neighborhoods was indicated on the adopted GP and also addressed on the update.

A member of the committee asked for clarification of activity centers, regional vs community. It was explained that a community center provided a smaller geographic area with services but the regional centers sought to attract customers from outside the city. Bob Leiter noted that in the GP update some existing centers would be redefined according to these guidelines. He also mentioned that areas such as Downtown/3rd Avenue would need to be given more clearly defined policies for redevelopment as a regional center with specific guidelines on where to focus commercial infrastructure, for example.

Bob Leiter distributed a table of recommendations from the EDS related to the GP Land Use and Transportation element. He noted that the first theme "Strong Community Character and Image" was important throughout the information gathering process for this GP update. He went through the list of the remaining 5 themes, noting that all were important considerations but of primary focus of this group was the #2 theme of "Healthy and Sustainable Economy".

He indicated that it was important to identify the key gateways to the city and devise means for creating landmarks of identity for a more positive entrance into the city. He expanded on each of the action items on the document and explained what the GP update was proposing to accomplish. He stated that the city needed to come up with specific locations for the regional technology park.

On the fiscal sustainability side, there would have to focus on strategies to use the Capital Improvement Programs and get assistance from the organizations such as SANDAG and CalTrans, which have infrastructure funding and get it directed to western Chula Vista.. Bob stated that the Land Use and Transportation element shows what will get built and the Economic Development element shows how to facilitate getting it done.

Bob mentioned several considerations for the community's attention with regard to transportation and mobility. He stated that transportation management was as important as building of new/more facilities. Some considerations were flexible work hours, carpooling, commuter busses, etc. Programs utilizing a combination of these should be developed. Another possible solution to improving mobility was alternative service standards for western CV and modifying the level of service to new development in the east. He mentioned proposed expansion on road access to the Otay Ranch area, going south to the border, also east/west connectors to improve the circulation in the southern part of the city.

In response to a comment from one member, Bob elaborated that there are plans to redo the converging area of the I5 corridor, in collaboration with CalTrans and SANDAG.

There was a general request for copies of the wall map which staff will provide to the committee.

It was noted that apart from improved transportation corridors to CV, there needs to be activity centers that attract visitors, possibly to the downtown area, to make CV a destination.

Cheryl Dye next presented her comments and made reference to the economic impacts of the issues raised by Bob and Tony on Land Use and Transportation. She referred to a handout document, a sample of economic development elements for Huntington Beach and Mission Viejo that showed similarities of the fundamental goals to the EDS. It was noted that this committee has accomplished all of the same outcomes with their development of the EDS.

Tony explained that legally, when all the different elements are completed and put together in the General Plan, the optional elements, once adopted by the city have the same status as required elements and must be consistent with each other.

Ed summarized that the information presented here would be taken to guide the development of the Land Use & Transportation proposal for the GP. He reminded them that the other subcommittees are also presenting their information on that element, but noted that there was much alignment of these so that not much friction was anticipated. He informed the group that the firm of ERA was contracted to do a Fiscal Impact Analysis that would review the fiscal soundness of these land use /transportation alternatives. They would develop a model for staff to analyze the GP land use/transportation alternatives, which would be tested by applying it to the adopted GP.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT – there were none

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00p.m. to the next meeting on March 5, 2003, at 6:00p.m. in Conference Room 2 & 3.

Recorded by,

Rabbia Phillip
Secretary, General Plan Update